



CITY OF HOUSTON

Sylvester Turner

Mayor

Jerry Adams
Chief Procurement Officer
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

T. 832.393.9126
<https://purchasing.houstontx.gov>

October 12, 2020

Subject: Letter of Clarification No. 1

Reference: Request for Proposals (RFP) No.: S36-T29535 Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Planning Services

To All Prospective Proposers:

This Letter of Clarification is issued for the following reason:

- **To respond to the following questions:**

1.	Question:	Could COH please clarify if the Concept Plan's maximum of 5-pages should be single-sided or double-sided (which makes a maximum of 10-pages)?
	Response:	<i>The City does not have a preference as to whether it is 5 pages single-sided or double-sided but does request that the information provided is presented in a concise manner.</i>
2.	Question:	In addition to one pilot delivery of Planning Workshop (page 6; section 3.1.9 – 3.1.10), could COH please clarify the number of additional workshops to be delivered by locally positioned assets from the contractor (page 6; section 3.1.10)?
	Response:	<i>The workshop will need to be delivered to each of the additional 13 partners (after the pilot delivery). The RCPI planners and the locally positioned assets would have to determine the best way to accomplish these deliveries.</i>
3.	Question:	Page 11, section 2.5 indicates timeline cannot exceed June 30, 2022, which is approximately 19-20 months from Notification of Intent to Award date. The RFP indicates that the contract is 3 years. Could COH please clarify the project timeline end date?
	Response:	<i>The timeline end date listed now is the end of our period of performance on the grant. However, the Lifelines Initiative could be extended.</i>
4.	Question:	Can the proposer include additional relevant sample deliverables in an addendum that are not associated with three Client Past Projects/References described on page 12, section 2.6 of the RFP?
	Response:	<i>Yes, the proposer can include additional relevant sample deliverables.</i>

Council Members: Amy Peck Jerry Davis Abbie Kamin Carolyn Evans-Shabazz Dave Martin Tiffany D. Thomas Greg Travis Karla Cisneros
Robert Gallegos Edward Pollard Martha Castex-Tatum Mike Knox David W. Robinson Michael Kubosh Letitia Plummer Sallie Alcorn

Controller: Chris Brown

5.	Question:	Could COH confirm that only short (200-word maximum) biographical sketches of key staff are needed? Can the proposer include full resumes of key staff?
	Response:	<i>The short biographical sketches are being requested; but, full resumes could be included as addenda.</i>
6.	Question:	Questions regarding Exhibit II Forms related to MWBE: A. Could COH please clarify that a printed copy of the Price Proposal/Fee Schedule and MWBE documents is not required, and only one electronic copy on a thumb drive is required? B. The RFP describes a signed "MWBE Letter of Intent form" on page 12, section 2.7. Is this requirement the same as the "Exhibit II, Attachment B Notice of Intent Form" to be submitted with the Price Proposal? If they are the same and related to the question above, is a signed/printed original copy required? C. Is Exhibit II Attachment D required with the proposal? This reporting form appears to include information to be reported/submitted post-award and during project implementation.
	Response:	<i>A. A printed copy of the price proposal/ fee schedule and MWBE documents is not required; only one electronic copy on a thumb drive is required. B. The "MWBE Letter of Intent" form referenced on Page 12, Section 2.7 is the same form included as Exhibit II, Attachment B, Notice of Intent. A signed copy of the Notice of Intent form is required. C. Exhibit II, Attachment "D" Office of Business Opportunity and Contract Compliance MWBE Utilization Report form is required to be submitted with proposal, although some information requested will be post-award.</i>
7.	Question	Is the City open to negotiating the terms and conditions of the Agreement at the contract stage with the successful bidder?
	Response:	<i>The City is open to negotiating the terms and conditions of the Agreement at the contract stage with the successful proposer.</i>
8.	Question	The submission instructions under Part IV, Section 1.1.2 state that the Price Proposal/Fee Schedule and M/WBE Forms should be submitted under separate cover from the Technical Proposal. However, Section 2.13 states that the M/WBE documents should be included with Tab 11 (Forms and Certifications) of the Technical Proposal. Which is correct?
	Response:	<i>Submit one (1) copy of the Price Proposal/Fee Schedule and M/WBE documents on a thumb drive in a separate single sealed envelope bearing the assigned solicitation number and title</i>
9.	Question:	The Project Summary states that the base period for this contract is three years with the potential for two 1-year extensions, while the Submission Requirements ask for a draft timeline that only goes to June 30, 2022. Can the City please confirm that the proposer's price proposal should reflect only the activities described in our Concept Plan (as scored in Part III, Section 5.2.2) of activities to be completed by June 30, 2022?
	Response:	<i>Yes, the proposer's price proposal should reflect only the activities described in its Concept Plan (as scored in Part III, Section 5.2.2) of activities to be completed by June 30, 2022.</i>
10.	Question:	Will all work during the initial three-year contract be conducted under the same grant source (FY19 RCPG)?

Council Members: Amy Peck Jerry Davis Abbie Kamin Carolyn Evans-Shabazz Dave Martin Tiffany D. Thomas Greg Travis Karla Cisneros
Robert Gallegos Edward Pollard Martha Castex-Tatum Mike Knox David W. Robinson Michael Kubosh Letitia Plummer Sallie Alcorn

Controller: Chris Brown

	Response:	<i>The City cannot confirm, at this time, that all work during the initial three-year contract will be conducted under the same grant source (FY19 RCPG).</i>
11.	Question	Would work assigned under either or both one-year extensions also be funded from the same grant source (FY19 RCPG)?
	Response:	<i>It is unknown, at this time, if work assigned under either or both one-year extensions will also be funded from the same grant source (FY19 RCPG). Any additional work and/or funding sources would be negotiated separately.</i>
12.	Question:	Can the City advise whether additional scope (beyond what is described in this solicitation) is envisioned to be assigned between June 30, 2022 and the expiration of the base three-year contract period?
	Response:	<i>The City cannot advise, at this time, whether additional scope (beyond what is described in this solicitation) is envisioned to be assigned between June 30, 2022 and the expiration of the base three-year contract period. As noted in the RFP (page 4, section 1.0), the additional lifelines may be included in later project phases.</i>
13.	Question:	Does the City have additional tasks to be completed during the two potential extensions?
	Response:	<i>The City wants to ensure that all of the deliverables listed in this RFP are completed and may add additional Lifelines as needed.</i>
14.	Question:	<p>Part II, Section 3.1.1 of the RFP states, "The Houston Regional Catastrophic Planning Team (RCPT) and partners will meet to discuss linking essential elements of information (EELs) captured in Emergency Operations Center settings and aligning with state, federal, and other organizational reporting mechanisms. Topics will also include technology concepts (including GIS and situational awareness dashboards) and standardized reporting." Separately, under Part II, Section 3.2.1, the RFP states, "The Contractor will assist in the development and implementation of five (5) seminars."</p> <p>Can the City clarify whether these tasks (3.1.1 and 3.1.2) are describing the same or different seminars? In other words, is the contractor facilitating the seminars (including pre-established agendas) described under 3.1.1, in the manner detailed in 3.1.2?</p>
	Response:	<i>The tasks in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 are describing the same seminars.</i>
15.	Question:	Are the "baseline assessment and planning workshops" referenced in Part II, Section 3.1.3 the same as the "community lifeline seminars" described under 3.1.1 and 3.1.2?
	Response:	<i>No, the "baseline assessment and planning workshops" referenced in Part II, Section 3.1.3 are not the same. These seminars will be conducted prior to the assessments and will help inform the assessment tool development.</i>
16.	Question:	If the baseline assessments and planning workshops are not the same, can the City please provide more information on the desired outcomes of the baseline assessments and planning workshops?
	Response:	<i>The baseline assessments will be conducted to identify gaps, needs, and best practices. The workshops will be conducted to socialize the final assessment products.</i>

Council Members: Amy Peck Jerry Davis Abbie Kamin Carolyn Evans-Shabazz Dave Martin Tiffany D. Thomas Greg Travis Karla Cisneros
Robert Gallegos Edward Pollard Martha Castex-Tatum Mike Knox David W. Robinson Michael Kubosh Letitia Plummer Sallie Alcorn

Controller: Chris Brown

17.	Question:	Is it correct that the “lifelines assessment tool” described in Part II, Section 3.1.3 is intended to support a “community lifelines assessment” as referenced in Part II, Section 3.1.5?
	Response:	<i>It is correct that the “lifelines assessment tool” described in Part II, Section 3.1.3 is intended to support a “community lifelines assessment” as referenced in Part II, Section 3.1.5.</i>
18.	Question:	If this assumption is incorrect, could the City provide information about the goal of the assessment tool described in 3.1.5?
	Response:	<i>The City cannot provide information about the goal of the assessment tool described in 3.1.5, and this information is not required to respond to the RFP.</i>
19.	Question:	How many “baseline community lifeline assessment” reports are to be developed and delivered under Part II, Section 3.1.5?
	Response:	<i>Fourteen (14) jurisdictional assessment reports plus one (1) regional assessment report are to be developed and delivered under Part II, Section 3.1.5, baseline community lifeline assessment?</i>
20.	Question:	As the scope of work could require a range of level of effort depending on the City’s desired outcome, could the City provide a desired level of effort or scale (number of stakeholders reached, number of data inputs, report length, etc.) for the baseline community lifeline assessments under Part II, Section 3.1.5?
	Response:	<i>While assessments for varying jurisdictional size will impact the scope of work and the planning team will have to help determine the best ways to capture the assessment data, we do appreciate that this could be difficult to capture in a proposal. The assessment tool should help standardize the inputs and data collection across the region and we anticipate that there will be some flexibility between proposal and execution of the awarded contract scope of work.</i>
21.		Can the City please confirm that meetings described in Part II, Section 5.0 can be conducted virtually?
	Response:	<i>Yes, meetings described in Part II, Section 5.0 can be conducted virtually. But outside of the pandemic environment, the City would prefer some of these meetings be held in-person.</i>
22.	Question:	Please confirm that only 1 (one) thumb drive with the Price Proposal/Fee Schedule is required, as stated in Part IV, Section 1.1.2.
	Response:	<i>Only 1 (one) thumb drive with the Price Proposal/Fee Schedule is required, as stated in Part IV, Section 1.1.2.</i>
23.	Question:	Page 5, Section 3.1.6, How many jurisdictions will be assessed via the baseline community lifelines assessment? Will it be each of the 13 counties plus the City of Houston, or are there additional local jurisdictions above a population threshold that should also be assessed?
	Response:	<i>The scope is for the 13 counties plus the City of Houston, but the planning team may decide that other cities with populations greater than 100,000 may need to be assessed on their own. The City would have the RCPI planners help gather this data if that is the case. The additional cities would not require their own assessment reports.</i>
24.	Question:	Page 5, Section 3.1.1, Will this project also assess non-governmental partner capabilities to support the food, water, shelter lifeline, such as VOAD partners, or will it be limited to local government?

Council Members: Amy Peck Jerry Davis Abbie Kamin Carolyn Evans-Shabazz Dave Martin Tiffany D. Thomas Greg Travis Karla Cisneros
Robert Gallegos Edward Pollard Martha Castex-Tatum Mike Knox David W. Robinson Michael Kubosh Letitia Plummer Sallie Alcorn

Controller: Chris Brown

	Response:	<i>This project will include VOADs and private partners.</i>
25.	Question:	Page 4, Section 1.0, Do you envision the lifelines assessment tool as a web-based assessment tool or integrated with an existing technology, such as WebEOC or ArcGIS?
	Response:	<i>The City is open to proposed options for the integration of the lifelines assessment tool.</i>
26.	Question:	Page 4, Section 1.0, Will the community lifelines assessment be limited to the food, water, shelter lifeline, or will it include the other six lifelines also?
	Response:	<i>This RFP is for the food, water, shelter lifeline. Additional lifelines may be included in later project phases.</i>
27.	Question:	Page 5, Section 3.1.5, Given the current COVID-19 environment, does the City of Houston envision regional engagement be conducted virtually? If so, is there a preferred platform for virtual engagement (e.g., Microsoft Teams, WebEx, Adobe Connect, etc.)?
	Response:	<i>In the current pandemic environment, the City does envision some of the outreach being conducted virtually. The City will provide the platforms (e.g., Teams, Go To Meeting, HSIN).</i>
28.	Question:	Page 5, Section 3.1.1 Do you anticipate the Community Lifelines Seminars being in-person or virtual? When do you expect the seminars will be held?
	Response:	<i>The City would like the seminars to be held in locations where social distancing meeting spaces are available, and the City would like to conduct the in-person meetings. For those locations where social distancing is not a viable option, the City will conduct them virtually. The City would like the seminars to be conducted in the early stages of the project.</i>
29.	Question:	Page 11, Section 2.5 During the pre-bid conference, a question was asked about the number pages allowed for Section 2.5 "Concept Plan for the Completion of Required Deliverables". Can the City please clarify if this section should be 5 pages total or 10 pages total (5 pages of front/back narrative)?
	Response:	<i>See Response to Question #1.</i>
30.	Question:	Can you speak more about the purpose of the lifelines assessment tool? 1. What sort of data is available as inputs (e.g. THIRA capability targets, social resilience indicators)? 2. Is it intended for use before or after a disaster? 3. Is the output a visualization, or a series of recommendations, or both?
	Response:	<i>The purpose of the lifeline assessment tool is as follows: 1. The data inputs are to be determined by the planning team and subject matter experts. The City plans to incorporate other assessments such as the THIRA; 2. The City plans to capture data to be used before, during, and after an incident; and 3. The output is both visualization and a series of recommendations.</i>
31.	Question:	Baseline assessment: How is data about non-profit/NGO resource support and private sector being sourced? Is the contractor responsible for collecting that data?

Council Members: Amy Peck Jerry Davis Abbie Kamin Carolyn Evans-Shabazz Dave Martin Tiffany D. Thomas Greg Travis Karla Cisneros
Robert Gallegos Edward Pollard Martha Castex-Tatum Mike Knox David W. Robinson Michael Kubosh Letitia Plummer Sallie Alcorn

Controller: Chris Brown

	Response:	<i>Data about non-profit/NGO resource support and private sector will be collected using both open source data and through contact with the entities. Both the contractor and the planners will facilitate the collection of this data.</i>
--	------------------	---

When issued, Letter(s) of Clarification shall automatically become a part of the solicitation documents and shall supersede any previous specification(s) and/or provision(s) in conflict with the Letter(s) of Clarification. All revisions and responses incorporated into the Letter(s) of Clarification are collaboratively from both the Strategic Procurement Division and the applicable City Departments(s). It is the responsibility of the proposer to ensure it has obtained all such letter(s). By submitting a proposal to this solicitation, proposers shall be deemed to have received all Letter(s) of Clarification and have incorporated them into this solicitation

If you have any questions or if further clarification is needed regarding this Request for Proposals, please contact Valerie Player-Kaufman at (832) 393-8749.

Regards,

DocuSigned by:
Carolyn Evans-Shabazz

E52E8339781D4B9...
Jerry Adams

Chief Procurement Officer

c: File T29535

DS
46

Council Members: Amy Peck Jerry Davis Abbie Kamin Carolyn Evans-Shabazz Dave Martin Tiffany D. Thomas Greg Travis Karla Cisneros
Robert Gallegos Edward Pollard Martha Castex-Tatum Mike Knox David W. Robinson Michael Kubosh Letitia Plummer Sallie Alcorn

Controller: Chris Brown